



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,958	04/08/2004	Eit Drent	TS-1302 (US) JDA:KNL	9545
23632	7590	05/24/2007		
SHELL OIL COMPANY P O BOX 2463 HOUSTON, TX 772522463			EXAMINER COVINGTON, RAYMOND K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,958

Applicant(s)

DRENT ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Covington

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

- I. Claims 1-16, drawn to compounds of formula I, classified in class 549, subclass 238.
- II. Claims 17-20, drawn to method of use for compound of formula I, classified in class 502, subclass 166.

Each Invention Set listed above is directed to or involves the use or making of compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse chemical structure, their different chemical properties, modes of action, different effects and reactive conditions (MPEP 806.04, MPEP 808.01). Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that one invention would be obvious over either of the other inventions, i.e. they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures which are similar are presumed to function similarly, whereas chemical structures that are not similar are not presumed to function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrebuttable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holdings of

Application of Papesch, 50 CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and In re Lalu, 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where the structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure.

The above Groups represent general areas wherein the inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Each of Groups I and III are distinct and independent, one from the other on the basis of structure defined in the claimed inventions as directed to a compound of formula I and II respectively. Absent factual evidence to the contrary, each is a different chemical compound.

Groups I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using the product (MPEP 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product, for example benzene carbonylation.

In addition, because of the plethora of classes and subclasses in each of the Groups, a serious burden is imposed on the examiner to perform a complete search of the defined areas. Therefore, because of the reasons given above, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

The following is a recitation of M.P.E.P. §821.04, Rejoinder:

Where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect claims to either the product or process. See MPEP § 806.05(f) and § 806.05(h). The claims to the nonelected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration under 37 CFR 1.142. See MPEP § 809.02© and § 821 through § 821.03. However, if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Where product and process claims are presented in a single application and that application qualifies under the transitional restriction practice pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b), applicant may either (1) elect the invention to be searched and examined and pay the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(s) and have the additional inventions searched and examined under 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2), or (2) elect the invention to be searched and examined and not pay the additional fee (37 CFR 1.129(b)(3)). Where no additional fee is paid, if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined. If applicant chooses to pay the fees to have the additional inventions searched and examined pursuant to 37 CFR 1.129(b)(2), even if the product is found allowable, applicant would not be entitled to a refund of the fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) by arguing that the process claims could have been rejoined. 37 CFR 1.26 states that "[m]oney paid by actual mistake or in excess will be refunded, but a mere change of purpose after the payment of money...will not entitle a party to demand such a return..." The fees paid under 37 CFR 1.129(b) were not paid

by actual mistake nor paid in excess, therefore, applicant would not be entitled to a refund.

In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 - 1.106. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.

The following is a recitation from paragraph five, "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. §103(b)" (1184 TMOG 86(March 26, 1996)):

"However, in the case of an elected product claim, rejoinder will be permitted when a product claim is found allowable and the withdrawn process claim **depends from or otherwise includes all the limitations of** an allowed product claim. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined." (emphasis added)

Therefore, in accordance with M.P.E.P. §821.04 and *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995), rejoinder of product claims with process claims commensurate in scope with the allowed product claims will occur following a finding that the product claims are allowable. Until, such time, a

restriction between product claims and process claims is deemed proper.

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to maintain either dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie at telephone number (571) 272-0681.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair->

Art Unit: 1625

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas McKenzie".

Thomas McKenzie

SPE

Art Unit 1625

Handwritten initials "RKC" in black ink.

RKC